

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 1738 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
:
ROBERT TURNBULL HALL : No. 49 DB 2011
:
: Attorney Registration No. 208426
:
: (Out of State)
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT :
:
:

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 6th day of July, 2020, the Petition for Reinstatement is granted. Petitioner is directed to pay the expenses incurred by the Board in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement. See Pa.R.D.E. 218(f).

A True Copy Patricia Nicola
As Of 07/06/2020


Attest:
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 1738 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
: :
: No. 49 DB 2011
ROBERT TURNBULL HALL : :
: Attorney Registration No. 208426
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : :
: (Out of State)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND JUSTICES
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA:

Pursuant to Rule 218(c)(5) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania submits its findings and recommendations to your Honorable Court with respect to the above captioned Petition for Reinstatement.

I. HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

By Order dated July 12, 2011, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania suspended Petitioner, Robert Turnbull Hall, for a period of two years, as a consequence of his submission of false applications to two law schools and his submission of false applications for admission to the bars of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Petitioner filed

a Petition for Reinstatement on May 2, 2019. Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) filed its response on August 5, 2019.

Following a prehearing conference on September 30, 2019, a District I Hearing Committee (“Committee”) conducted a reinstatement hearing on November 1, 2019. Petitioner presented three witnesses and testified on his own behalf. Petitioner’s Exhibits P-1 through P-36 were admitted into evidence without objection. ODC did not call any witnesses or offer any exhibits.

In support of his reinstatement, Petitioner filed a brief to the Committee on December 26, 2019. By letter dated January 3, 2020, ODC advised that it did not oppose Petitioner’s reinstatement.

By Report filed on March 3, 2020, the Committee concluded that Petition met his reinstatement burden and recommended that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted.

The Board adjudicated this matter at the meeting on April 22, 2020.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following findings:

1. Petitioner is Robert Turnbull Hall, born in 1978 and admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 2008. Petitioner’s address is P.O. Box 118, Crosswicks, NJ 08515. Petitioner is subject to the jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

2. On July 12, 2011, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania granted a Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent, and ordered that Petitioner be suspended for a period of two years. P-1; Answer to 3(a), Attachment to 3(b).

3. Petitioner was suspended for submitting false applications to law school and false applications to the Pennsylvania and New Jersey bars, in violation of PA RPC 8.1(a) and NJ RPC 8.1(a); PA RPC 8.1(b) and NJ RPC 8.1(b); PA RPC 8.4(c) and NJ RPC 8.4(c); and PA RPC 8.4(d) and NJ RPC 8.4(d). P-1; Answer to 3(a), Attachment to 3(b).

Misconduct

Findings 4 – 32 are based on the Joint Petition for Discipline on Consent at P-1, Attachment to 3(b):

4. As a teenager, Petitioner attended The Hill School, a boarding school in Pottstown, Pennsylvania, from 1992 until February 1995, at which time he was expelled for smoking marijuana.

5. On May 4, 1997, Petitioner was arrested in Rhode Island and charged with unlawful possession of a controlled substance. Petitioner pleaded guilty to the criminal charge. The Newport District Court gave Petitioner a “one-year filing” and a \$200.00 fine. The “one-year filing” was a penalty for first-time offenders which deferred a criminal case for one year and expunged an alleged offender’s record, providing there were no further violations during that time period.

6. Petitioner attended Washington and Lee University from August 1997 until his graduation in May 2001. In 1997, during Petitioner’s first semester at

college, he was arrested for public intoxication, urinating in public, and indecent exposure. The matter was concluded when Petitioner admitted guilt and paid a fine. On March 29, 1998, during his second semester at college, Petitioner was arrested for public intoxication. The matter was concluded when Petitioner admitted guilt and paid a fine.

7. Petitioner's arrests and convictions as described above violated a condition of his first offender "one-year filing" opportunity in Rhode Island.

8. On April 5, 1999, while operating another individual's truck, Petitioner caused an alcohol-related accident in a West Virginia parking lot and fled the scene without stopping and identifying himself. The truck owner instituted a civil proceeding against Petitioner as a result of the accident. The civil suit was later dismissed.

9. On April 2, 2000, Petitioner was arrested and charged with misdemeanor possession of marijuana. The Virginia District Court deferred making an adjudication and placed Petitioner on "first-time offender probation," mandating payment of \$225.00 in court costs, along with the suspension of his driver's license for six months, and participation in a twenty-two week outpatient drug education program.

10. On September 13, 2000, Petitioner appeared in Virginia District Court on a failure to comply charge, when he failed to begin the mandated drug education program on its commencement date. Petitioner explained to the court that he was confused about the program's start date; as a result of this explanation, Petitioner was granted a second opportunity to attend the program.

11. Petitioner started the twenty-two week court-ordered drug education program, which required participants to submit to breathalyzer testing before each class.

Petitioner failed the breathalyzer test on week twenty of the program. As a consequence, Petitioner was required to attend four additional weeks of the program. Petitioner did not complete the program.

12. In August 2001, the Virginia General District Court issued a "Show Cause Summons" to Petitioner requiring him to appear and address his non-compliance with the drug education program. Petitioner failed to appear.

13. In September 2001, the Virginia General District Court found Petitioner guilty of unlawful possession of marijuana.

False Law School Applications

14. On October 27, 2004, Petitioner applied for admission to Albany Law School.

15. Petitioner lied on the application by failing to disclose requested information about his prior misconduct including:

- a. He was expelled from The Hill School for smoking marijuana;
- b. He was charged with two failures to comply with the directives of the Virginia General District Court in connection with his April 2, 2000 arrest for possession of marijuana; and
- c. He was a defendant in the West Virginia lawsuit.

16. On the Albany Law School application, Petitioner certified that the information he provided was complete and accurate.

17. Petitioner matriculated at Albany Law School in August 2005.

18. On March 22, 2006, Petitioner completed a transfer application for admission to Rutgers Law School at Camden.

19. Petitioner lied on the transfer application by directly stating or implying the following:

a. He had been "dismissed" from The Hill School because he was present in a room with people who were smoking marijuana;

b. He completed the Virginia General District Court drug education program; and

c. He no longer used alcohol or marijuana.

20. Petitioner further failed to disclose the following on the Rutgers Law School transfer application:

a. He was expelled from The Hill School for smoking marijuana; and

b. In two separate charges, the Virginia General District Court summoned him to account for his delay in completing the drug education program and for failing to complete the drug education program.

21. Petitioner certified on the transfer application that the information was complete and accurate.

22. In August 2006, Petitioner matriculated at Rutgers Law School in Camden.

False Applications for Admission to the Bars of Pennsylvania and

New Jersey

23. On or about February 9, 2008, Petitioner electronically filed an application with the Pennsylvania Board of Law Examiners (“the PA App”) to sit for the July 2008 bar examination.

24. Petitioner lied or failed to disclose required information on the PA App as follows:

a. Answering “No” in response to the question under the heading “DOCUMENTS – ALTERED OR FALSIFIED,” which inquired if he had ever “altered or falsified any official or unofficial document or copy thereof (e.g. law school application);

b. Under the “CRIMINAL – CRIMINAL HISTORY” heading, not stating that he had been charged with a failure to comply in connection with his April 2, 2000 arrest for possession of marijuana;

c. Under the “CRIMINAL – CRIMINAL HISTORY” heading, not stating the fact that he never completed the court-ordered drug education program; and

d. Under the COURT RELATED – DEFENDANT” heading, not stating that he had been named as a defendant in the West Virginia motor vehicle action against him.

25. Petitioner certified that the “statements of facts” made by him on the PA App were “true and correct” and that they were made “subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.”

26. Petitioner also verified that he had “not omitted any facts or matters pertinent” to the PA App.

27. The omissions and misrepresentations set forth in paragraph 24, *supra*, were material to the PA App and were material to Petitioner’s qualifications to practice law.

28. On February 11, 2008, Petitioner filed with the State of New Jersey Committee on Character a Certified Statement of Candidate (“the NJ Cert”), therein applying to sit for the July 2008 bar examination.

29. Petitioner lied and failed to disclose the same information referenced in paragraph 24, *supra*.

30. Petitioner also answered “No” in response to the question under the heading “MISCELLANEOUS,” which inquired if there was any information that was not specifically addressed and/or asked in the instructions that could be considered a character issue.

31. Petitioner’s omissions were material to the NJ Cert and were material to Petitioner’s qualifications to practice law.

32. On May 17, 2010, the Supreme Court of New Jersey withheld Petitioner’s certification for admission to the New Jersey bar for one year due to his past issues with alcohol and marijuana, his repeated failure to disclose those issues on his law

school and bar applications and insufficient rehabilitation evidence to warrant his bar admission. P-1, Attachments to 7(a), (b), and (d).

33. Petitioner did not pursue admission in New Jersey thereafter, and is waiting until he is reinstated in Pennsylvania before applying to the New Jersey bar. P-1, Answer to 20; N.T. 40.

Post-Suspension Activities

34. Since 2008, Petitioner has been employed as a law clerk, legal assistant, and legislative liaison for the New Jersey Office of Administrative Law (OAL), a state agency composed of administrative law judges who resolve disputes arising from the decisions of other states and local agencies. P-1; N.T. 14-15.

35. None of these positions require a law license. N.T. 22

36. While at the OAL, Petitioner has conducted research on numerous areas of law including education, Medicaid, community affairs, labor, civil services, civil rights, and environmental protection. Petitioner has written over 300 legal memoranda for administrative law judges. P-1, Answers to 19(e) and 21.

37. If reinstated, Petitioner intends to remain employed with the OAL. N.T. 186.

38. Since his suspension in 2011, Petitioner has completed numerous continuing legal education courses, and in the year prior to filing the reinstatement petition, completed 37.5 credit hours, including 15.5 hours of ethics. P-1, Answers to 19(a) and (c).

39. From 2009 to 2011, Petitioner participated in a senior outreach program in which he visited an elderly woman once a week and sometimes took her for walks. Even though he was doing this as part of his efforts to get admitted to the New Jersey bar, Petitioner testified that it made him feel good. N.T. 166.

40. Petitioner served as an usher at his church from 2011 to 2016. N.T. 168.

41. In 2010, Petitioner become involved with the alumni admissions program through Washington and Lee University. He continued in this program until 2015, when the university learned about his disciplinary status and asked him to resign. N.T. 170.

42. During his suspension, Petitioner married and he and his wife have two young children. N.T. 64.

43. Petitioner and his wife incurred federal and state income tax debt for tax years 2015 and 2016 because they failed to report income paid through Petitioner's wife's grant program at Columbia University. Petitioner and his wife also incurred federal and state tax debt for tax years 2017 and 2018 for underpayment of taxes. N.T. 79-81, 83, 178-184.

44. Petitioner and his wife entered into an installment agreement with the Internal Revenue Service and the New Jersey Division of Taxation to satisfy tax debt, interest, and penalties they incurred for tax years 2015-2018. N.T. 82-98.

45. Petitioner and his wife have fully satisfied their federal tax debt from tax year 2015 and they have satisfied their state tax debt for tax years 2015 and 2017. N.T. 100.

46. Petitioner and his wife expect to satisfy their known tax debt by March 2020. N.T. 99-100, 105-106.

47. Petitioner testified that he and his wife take the couple's tax debt very seriously and noted that they have made significant efforts to address this debt. N.T. 183-184.

Petitioner's Testimony

48. Petitioner credibly testified on his own behalf.

49. Petitioner explained that he made a series of bad decisions as a younger person and that due to his immaturity, stubbornness, selfishness, and bad attitude, he did not learn from his mistakes despite serious consequences, including his expulsion from high school and multiple arrests. N.T. 137-138.

50. Petitioner "got his act together" in his mid-twenties, stopped abusing alcohol and using marijuana, and decided to attend law school. N.T. 138-139, 148-149.

51. As part of the New Jersey bar admission process, Petitioner was evaluated by the New Jersey Lawyers Assistance Program (NJLAP) in 2008. N.T. 152-153.

52. The NJLAP concluded that Petitioner "does not have a current problem with substance abuse affecting his fitness to practice law," but due to Petitioner's past issues with alcohol and marijuana, the NJLAP recommended that Petitioner "attend

support group meetings to reinforce a drug free lifestyle and sensitivity about substance abuse.” N.T. 153, 195-196.

53. Following the NJLAP evaluation, Petitioner attended Alcoholics Anonymous and Lawyers Concerned for Lawyers meetings between 2008 and 2011. N.T. 157.

54. In an effort to prove that he did not have a substance abuse issue, Petitioner chose to abstain from alcohol between 2009 and 2011. N.T. 116-117, 120, 152, 156-157, 195-196.

55. Petitioner has not smoked marijuana or used any illicit drugs in nearly fifteen years, with the exception of smoking marijuana once in 2008. N.T. 120-121, 123, 153-159.

56. Since 2011, Petitioner has occasionally consumed alcohol in moderation and does not believe he has a current issue with alcohol and drugs. N.T. 120-121.

57. Petitioner is ashamed of his misconduct. He expressed genuine remorse for his lack of candor on his law school applications and bar admission applications. N.T. 141-147, 160-163.

58. Petitioner testified that there was no excuse for his misconduct. He admitted that he intentionally misrepresented or omitted certain facts on his applications due to embarrassment and shame, and for fear that full disclosure of his past misconduct would prevent his law school or bar admission. N.T. 141-142.

59. Petitioner acknowledged that his repeated lack of candor on his applications warranted the withholding of his bar admission in New Jersey and the two year suspension of his license in Pennsylvania. N.T. 142-143.

60. Petitioner now understands the importance of candor and has acted accordingly in his professional and personal dealings. N.T. 175-177, 184-192.

61. Petitioner described the disciplinary actions taken against him as a traumatic experience, but he explained that he has learned from the serious professional consequences of his actions and vowed to never again put his livelihood or his family's well-being at risk through illegal or unethical conduct. N.T. 160-163.

Witness Testimony

62. Three witnesses credibly testified on behalf of Petitioner. All of the witnesses have been aware of Petitioner's misconduct for at least several years.

63. Sandrya L. Porter, Esquire, supervised Petitioner at OAL from 2008 to 2014. Ms. Porter described Petitioner's legal research and writing as "exceptional" and depicted Petitioner as "treasured" and "very well respected at the agency." N.T. 19-21, 23-24, 30-31.

64. Ms. Porter testified that in her six years as Petitioner's supervisor, Petitioner was never disciplined and she never had any concerns about his job performance. N.T. 24-25, 30-31, 33-34.

65. Ms. Porter described Petitioner as trustworthy, truthful, and ethical, and believed that Petitioner was remorseful for acting inconsistently with those traits. She

opined that Petitioner has the character and fitness to practice law in Pennsylvania. N.T. 22-23, 28-31.

66. Jennifer Campbell, Esquire, is Petitioner's current supervisor at OAL. Ms. Campbell has supervised Petitioner since 2014 and testified that Petitioner's work is "exceptional" and stated that administrative law judges "seek [Mr. Hall] out specifically for his legal analysis." N.T. 44-45.

67. Ms. Campbell testified that over the years she has had many conversations with Petitioner about his license issues and described Petitioner as remorseful for his actions. Ms. Campbell repeatedly encouraged Petitioner to resolve his license issues "because I think he deserves it." N.T. 49, 52-54, 59-60.

68. Ms. Campbell believes that Petitioner has the character and fitness to practice law in Pennsylvania. N.T. 44-45.

69. Aisling O'Hara is Petitioner's wife. She and Petitioner have been married since 2011 and have two children. She testified that Petitioner is a responsible, loving and supportive father and husband. N.T. 64-65.

70. Petitioner's wife testified "I don't think there's a day that goes by that we both don't think about" Petitioner's license issues, and she described Petitioner as "extremely remorseful" for his lack of candor on his law school and bar admission applications. N.T. 66-68.

71. Petitioner's wife believes that Petitioner has the character and fitness to practice law in Pennsylvania. N.T. 68, 100-101, 128.

72. Petitioner's wife is proud of Petitioner's decision to seek reinstatement and stated that Petitioner wants to use this experience to teach their children about the importance of taking responsibility and making amends for mistakes. N.T. 125-127.

73. In support of Petitioner's reinstatement, the director of OAL, Lisa James-Beaver submitted a letter describing Petitioner as a "role model" and a diligent employee who would be an asset to the Pennsylvania bar. P-1, Letter of Ms. Lisa James-Beaver.

74. In support of Petitioner's reinstatement, Reverend Paul Jeanes, III, Rector of Trinity Church in Princeton, New Jersey, submitted a letter stating that he has known Petitioner for ten years and discussed with him "the truth of his accomplishments and failures, his strengths and weaknesses, his dreams and disappointments." P-1, Letter of Rev. Paul Jeanes, III.

75. Rev. Jeanes further stated that Petitioner is "fully aware of the gravity of his mistakes and the seriousness of this opportunity for another chance."

76. Rev. Jeanes concluded that Petitioner is "a better man for his season of self-examination and reflection" and that he without hesitation fully supports Petitioner in his "desire to be reinstated to the high privilege of practicing law."

77. ODC does not oppose Petitioner's reinstatement.

III. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Petitioner demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that he has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice of law in this Commonwealth. Rule 218(c)(3), Pa.R.D.E.

2. Petitioner demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that his resumption of the practice of law will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. Rule 218(c)(3), Pa.R.D.E

IV. DISCUSSION

Petitioner seeks readmission to the practice of law following his suspension on consent for a period of two years, ordered by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on July 12, 2011. Pursuant to Rule 218(a)(1), Pa.R.D.E., an attorney who is suspended for a period exceeding one year may not resume the practice of law until reinstated by the Court.

Petitioner bears the burden of proving by evidence that is clear and convincing, that he is morally qualified, competent and learned in the law and that his resumption of the practice of law will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3). This burden is not light, and reinstatement is not automatic. A reinstatement proceeding is a searching inquiry into a lawyer's present professional and moral fitness to resume the practice of law. The object of concern is not solely the transgressions that

gave rise to the lawyer's suspension, but rather, the nature and extent of the rehabilitative efforts made since the time the sanction was imposed and the degree of success achieved in the rehabilitative process. ***Philadelphia News, Inc. v. Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania***, 363 A.2d 779, 780-781 (Pa. 1976).

We conclude from the evidence of record that Petitioner spent his suspension period engaged in genuine rehabilitation. See ***In the Matter of Robert Toland, II***, No. 104 DB 2009 (D. Bd. Rpt. 11/1/2019) (S. Ct. Order 12/3/2019); ***In the Matter of Peter C. Ibe***, No. 7 DB 2014 (D. Bd. Rpt. 10/28/2019) (S. Ct. Order 12/3/2019); ***In the Matter of Robert P. Maizel***, No. 26 DB 2014 (D. Bd. Rpt. 10/15/2018) (S. Ct. Order 11/16/2018). Petitioner met the requirements of Rule 218(c)(3), Pa.R.D.E., by presenting credible evidence of his moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law. Although Petitioner's original dishonest conduct caused his suspension, he has demonstrated via his own testimony, the testimony of his witnesses, his character letters and other exhibits, that his reinstatement will not harm the public or be detrimental to the integrity of the profession.

Petitioner's suspension was the result of his submission of false applications to two law schools and false applications for admission to the bars of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Petitioner was not candid on his law school applications, failing to reveal or mischaracterizing that he was expelled from high school for smoking marijuana; was charged with two failures to comply with a court order in connection with a 2000 arrest for possession of marijuana; was a defendant in a civil proceeding related to a motor vehicle accident in West Virginia; never completed the rehabilitation program

he was ordered to complete in connection with his April 2000 arrest; and misrepresenting that after he “completed” the rehabilitative program, he ceased using drugs and alcohol. Petitioner’s lack of candor continued when he submitted verified bar admission applications that contained similar omissions and misrepresentations concerning his background, which omissions and misrepresentations were material to Petitioner’s qualifications to practice law in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Petitioner did not minimize his misconduct and credibly described his shame, regret, and embarrassment. Petitioner candidly admitted that he was a “hard-partying, self-absorbed youth” (P-1, Answer to Question 21), and further acknowledged that alcohol and drug use played a significant role in his youthful problems. Petitioner explained that he intentionally misrepresented or omitted facts on his applications because he was embarrassed about his prior bad conduct and feared being rejected by the law schools and the bar admission authorities. While we accept Petitioner’s explanation for his actions, his inclination towards dishonesty occurred not once, but multiple times over the course of four years, and is very troubling when considering that Petitioner was seeking admission to a profession where honesty is paramount. What the Board is most concerned with is Petitioner’s rehabilitation from his deliberately dishonest conduct, and we seek assurance that Petitioner fully comprehends the critical importance of candor in his conduct. On this record, we are satisfied that Petitioner has achieved this level of understanding.

The record amply demonstrates that Petitioner has rehabilitated himself from the underlying misconduct and is morally qualified, competent, and learned in in the

law. The Board concludes that Petitioner has spent the past eight years since his suspension focused on ensuring that his current professional and personal life is conducted with the utmost honesty and integrity. There is no doubt that Petitioner accepts full responsibility for his misconduct and sincerely regrets his actions. Petitioner convincingly assured the Committee and now this Board that the misconduct that caused his suspension is not characteristic of the person he is today, and his prior wrongdoing will not be repeated in the future.

Petitioner comes before this Board as a hard-working, productive family man devoted to his wife and children. During his suspension, Petitioner maintained regular employment at OAL, where he is highly-regarded as a trustworthy employee who is relied upon for his exceptional legal writing and research skills. Petitioner was candid with his employers about his misconduct.

Petitioner is an attentive and loving husband and father who hopes that his past experiences will be a guide to his children. Petitioner performed community service during his suspension for a senior outreach program, his college alumni association, and his church. Petitioner stayed up-to-date with legal developments by fulfilling his required Continuing Legal Education credits and through extensive legal research as part of his employment responsibilities. Petitioner expects to continue his employment with OAL post-reinstatement. Petitioner has resolved his substance abuse issues by ceasing drug use and only using alcohol in moderation. Petitioner addressed concerns regarding his tax debt by submitting documentation to show that he and his wife have worked diligently

with the IRS and have brought their taxes up to date as of 2018, and have a plan to fully satisfy the debt in 2020.

Petitioner's three witnesses offered credible testimony to demonstrate that Petitioner has truly learned from his experiences, has made positive changes in his life, and is a moral, competent, and hard-working individual whose reinstatement will not present a danger to the public or harm the integrity and standing of the bar. Ms. Porter and Ms. Campbell provided valuable insight into Petitioner's competence as a lawyer, and neither expressed any concern as to his prior substance abuse or lack of candor. Petitioner's wife offered insight into Petitioner's remorse for his prior bad acts and his lifestyle changes that have transformed him into a supportive husband and father. These witnesses share a high opinion of Petitioner despite his misconduct, which they believe is not indicative of Petitioner's true character. In addition to the witness testimony, Petitioner submitted two letters of reference from individuals who support his reinstatement and think highly of him as a person of good character.

Upon the record before us, we conclude that Petitioner has met his burden of proof that his resumption of the practice of law within the Commonwealth will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar nor subversive of the public interest. Petitioner has demonstrated clearly and convincingly that he is fit to practice law. The Board recommends that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted.

V. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that Petitioner, Robert Turnbull Hall, be reinstated to the practice of law.

The Board further recommends that, pursuant to Rule 218(f), Pa.R.D.E., Petitioner be directed to pay the necessary expenses incurred in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

By: 
Christopher M. Miller, Member

Date: 6/8/2020